

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1-4, 11-15 and 22 have been amended and new claims 23 and 24 are added. No new matter is presented.

Approval and entry of the foregoing title and claim amendments are respectfully requested.

ITEM 1: OBJECTION TO TITLE

The Title of the invention has been amended as suggested by the Examiner.

ITEM 3: REJECTION OF CLAIMS 2 AND 13 UNDER 35 USC § 112, ¶ 2

The Examiner rejects claims 2 and 13 under 35 USC § 112, ¶ 2, as being indefinite and unclear because of the recitation "portions" in the claims. In response to the rejection, claims 2 and 13 have been amended so that the inventions recited in the claims become clear.

The same amendments have been made in claims 11 and 22, accordingly.

ITEM 4: REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-3, 7-8, 12-14 AND 18-19 FOR ANTICIPATION UNDER 35 USC § 102(e) BY SHINODA ET AL.

The Examiner rejects claims 1-3, 7-8, 12-14, and 18-19 under 35 USC § 102(e), as being anticipated by Shinoda et al. However, not each and every element of the inventions of claims 1-3, 7-8, 12-14, and 18-19 is disclosed in Shinoda et al., as is required to support an anticipation rejection, for the following reasons.

(a) In claims 1 and 12:

The inventions in claims 1 and 12 are not disclosed in Shinoda et al. This is clear from the fact that in Shinoda et al., a shielding part in the metal layer 42 itself (bus electrode in the present invention). Also, there exist no shielding parts which are formed on the sides of the bus electrode in Shinoda et al.

(b) In claims 2 and 13:

Since claims 2 and 13 are dependent on claims 1 and 12, respectively, they should be allowed when claims 1 and 12 are allowed.

(c) In claims 3 and 14:

The inventions in claims 3 and 14, which are amended and made independent, are not disclosed in Shinoda et al. This is clear from the fact that the projecting parts of the transparent conductor strips 41' in Shinoda et al. do not have shield parts.

(d) In claims 7-8 and 18-19:

Since claims 7-8 and 18-19 are dependent on claims 1 and 12, respectively, they should be allowed when claims 1 and 12 are allowed.

CONCLUSION

The indicated allowability of claims 4-6, 9-11, 15-17 and 20-22 in item 5 of the Action is acknowledged and gratefully appreciated.

Those claims have not been so rewritten at the present time in view of the foregoing demonstration of patentability of the claims from which they depend.

There being no other objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: August 7, 2003

By: 

H. J. Staas
Registration No. 22,010

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501